DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 217 SO 020 107

AUTHOR	Cole, Donald B.; Pressly, Thomas
TITLE	Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers. Third Edition Revised.
INSTITUTION	American Historical Association, Washington, DC. Teaching Div.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87229-025-5
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	34p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Improvement; General Education; Higher Education; *History Instruction; Masters Degrees; *Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; Social Studies; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This document is addressed to individuals concerned with the preparation of history teachers at the secondary-school level. The role of history is to provide a critical approach to the past, not simply to store and transmit the data society wants remembered. In order to produce effective teachers, a program of preparation depends, in part, upon the selection of individuals who possess the intellectual potential for becoming good history teachers. High school and college teachers should play a more active role in encouraging some individuals to become teachers while discouraging others. A model four-year undergraduate program for the preparation of secondary-school history teachers is suggested. A teacher's general educational background, approximately one-third of the program, should include courses in the general areas of language, literature, the arts, philosophy, mathematics, natural science, history, religion, social and behavioral science. Studies in history and closely-related disciplines should comprise about one-half of the program. It is recommended that a prospective history teacher take an undergraduate major in history. He/she should take at least 27 semester hours in subjects closely related to history, preferably concentrated in one humanistic and one social or behavioral science discipline. Several conceptions of teacher training are discussed as the final one-sixth component of the program. Ideally, teacher education should be spread over five years in programs such as a Master of Arts in Teaching program. Supplementary programs of preparation are discussed and cooperation/coordination of effort between secondary and college history teachers is recommended. (GEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Samuel R. Gammen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

400 A Street, SE, Washington, DC 20003

1983 OFFICERS

President:	Philip D. Curtin, Johns Hopkins University
President-Elect:	Arthur S. Link, Princeton University
Executive Director:	Samuel R. Gammon
Editor:	Otto Pflaze, Indiana University
Controller:	James H. Leatherwood

COUNCIL

Philip D. Curtin
Arthur S. Link

Gordon A. Craig
Samuel R. Gammon, **ex officio**

Mary F. Berry, Vice-President
Professional Division (1983)
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
and Howard University

Gerhard L. Weinberg, Vice-President
Research Division (1984)
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

John A. Garraty, Vice-President
Teaching Divison (1985)
Columbia University

Elizabeth L. Eisenstein (1984)
University of Michigan
Robert I. Rothberg (1984)
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
Robert M. Warner (1984)
Archivist of the United States

Joyce O. Appleby (1985)
University of California,
Los Angeles
Katherine Fischer Drew (1985)
Rice University
Frederic E. Wakeman, Jr. (1985)
University of California,
Berkeley

SO 020 107

PREPARATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL HISTORY TEACHERS

Third Edition, Revised

by

Donald B. Cole and Thomas Pressly

for the

American Historical Association's
Teaching Division

©Copyright, American Historical Association, 1983
All rights reserved

Library of Congress catalog card number: 83-72077
ISBN 0-87229-025-5

CONTENTS

	Introduction	4
I.	Conditions and Considerations	7
II.	Programs of Preparation for Secondary-School Teachers	10
	General Educational Background	10
	Training in History	12
	Training in Subjects Closely Related to History	14
	Training in Teaching	16
III.	Supplementing Programs of Preparation	23
IV.	Cooperation and Coordination of Effort Between Teachers of History in Secondary School and Those in Colleges and Universities	26

Introduction

This statement is addressed to individuals concerned with the preparation of history teachers at the secondary-school level. Specifically it is addressed to state boards of education and their agencies which certify teachers, to the members of local boards of education who employ teachers, to school administrators who nominate and assign teachers, and to faculty members in colleges and universities, who teach the programs through which instructors are prepared. We particularly address it to prospective teachers and to those presently teaching, for instructors themselves ultimately play one of the most important roles in their own preparation, and it is a role that does not end with certification or with the first year of teaching.

The problems of teaching history today vary so from place to place that no one statement can apply equally well to all situations. While this statement is concerned with the fundamental issues of teaching history, it speaks most directly to those who will be teaching academic students. It does not, for example, answer all the needs of those teaching in the inner city, or of those teaching in any location whose students are not going to college. Nor does this pamphlet address the difficulties of those who teach in districts in which declining enrollment and severe budget constraints place teachers' jobs in jeopardy. Those who teach in these and other inhospitable situations may think that their preparation should have included courses in "personal survival." The authors of this pamphlet wish to express their sympathy for teachers in those situations, even though the pamphlet itself does not deal with their special problems. In this statement the American Historical Association, through two of its members, is expressing anew continuing interest of the association in the teaching of history in secondary schools.[1]

[1]This statement is a revision of the second edition of this pamphlet, also written by Messrs. Cole and Pressly, which appeared in 1968. The second edition was essentially new, but the authors followed many of the ideas of the original statement of 1962 and quoted from it on several occasions. Committee on Teaching of the American Historical Association, Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers (Washington, D.C., 1962). A subcommittee consisting of William H. Cartwright (chair), Natt B. Burbank, and Stanley J. Idzerda prepared the 1962 statement.

Perspective, 1983. At the time this pamphlet goes to press, many teachers of history at all academic levels of instruction perceive a crisis in the teaching of history. One vivid description of the situation can be found in the opening paragraphs of the annual report, December 1980, of the vice-president, Teaching Division, of the American Historical Association:

> The historical profession faces an unparalleled challenge in the coming decade. It is nothing less than to convince a skeptical public that history is still the essential key to understanding the modern world and to restore the discipline to a central place in the curriculum of school and college. As we move into the troubled and perplexed world of the '80s, the need of our citizens to have a comprehensive understanding of the nation and the world becomes more vitally important, and as sophisticated historical investigation has more knowledge and insight to offer than ever before, society continues to devalue history as a source of knowledge, mode of thought and academic discipline. . . .[Many individuals think] that history is all very interesting, but it is hardly useful and does not pay. . . .Where history is not being pushed out of the curriculum, it is being watered down, taught by non-professionals, or relegated to a large array of electives and mini-courses as social problem and vocationally-oriented courses muscle their way into the academic curriculum.

Without erasing this grave portrait, a later section of the report did describe one recent development in the teaching of history which it called "a phenomenal success." That development was the growth of the National History Day program, somewhat like science fairs, in which high school, junior high school and elementary school students prepare projects on a given historical theme, which are then entered in a series of local and state competitions, culminating in a national contest of state winners held in the Washington, D.C., area. National History Day began as an experiment in one locality in 1974; by 1980 nineteen states held contests in which 20,000 students participated, and in 1982 100,000 students participated in forty states. The organizers hope to have all fifty states represented by 1985.

A second recent development in the teaching of history, although not mentioned in the report quoted above, seems also worth noting here -- the growth in the past few years of "public history." "Public history" (sometimes called "applied history") includes, among other activities, the teaching of history, not through formal classes in schools and colleges, but through presentations outside classrooms in museums, libraries, national and local parks, historic preservation sites, public and private archives, and in various other locations. In particular, the interest in historic preservation and the interest in family history (sometimes called the "Roots" phenomenon) seem to be widespread at the grassroots level throughout the country. These various activities in public history offer both intellectual and employment opportunities to teachers of history at all academic levels, and a number of university history departments have developed undergraduate and graduate courses and programs to train persons for careers in this field.

The outlook for the teaching of history in 1983 thus presents signs of a discouraging lack of interest in history, but also at least two signs of widespread interest manifested in the History Day program and in public history. It may be that in any era the outlook for the teaching of history has contained similar discouraging and encouraging prospects. Many of the reasons for these prospects in 1983 stem from developments beyond the control of history teachers and those who train them. More subject to the control of those two groups is the quality of the programs in which prospective teachers of history are prepared, and it may be that one of the most practical ways to advance the teaching of history today is to insure the high quality of programs of preparation. It is to that task that this pamphlet is directed.

I. Conditions and Considerations

Most of us, in looking back at our years as students, can recall teachers whose classes we looked forward to with interest, excitement, and respect, while we can remember others whose classes we dreaded because they did not stimulate interest in the subject taught, nor stimulate conviction that the subject was important. Those memories pose the question that summarizes many of the problems related to the preparation of teachers: "what program of training is most likely to produce teachers whose classes students will anticipate with intellectual interest and respect, and is least likely to supply teachers who fail to stimulate students?"

Plans for the preparation of teachers of history rest upon an image or model of what a well-prepared teacher could reasonably be expected to do. Sometimes these models are unconscious and implicit, but we believe it wise to make them a conscious and explicit prologue to this discussion of the training of secondary-school history teachers. From our recollections of our own teachers of history, and from our observations of teachers and students over the years, we single out the winning of the intellectual interest and respect of students as an important characteristic of the well-prepared teacher. In the classes of such a teacher, the students are convinced that they are getting something worthwhile, because the teacher thoroughly understands the subject and is able both to discuss the subject with clarity and order, and also to transmit to students the importance, relevance, and excitement of the intellectual issues at stake.

We base our concept of the well-prepared secondary-school teacher of history also on the functions that teachers and the educational system as a whole are performing in the society, and hence on what the society, or influential segments of the society, expect teachers of history to be able to do once they are trained. The functions that the schools and the history teachers have been expected to perform in the United States have varied considerably from one era to another. At the turn of the twentieth century, history teachers seem to have gone about their tasks with more assurance than today. Many persons agreed that history was primarily the past politics of Europe and America. Many historians accepted the dictum, attributed to Leopold von Ranke,

that their duty was to collect facts and to present history as "it really happened." The social sciences had barely emerged as organized disciplines. There was little sense of urgency, for only 95,000 students (then about six percent of Americans aged eighteen) graduated each year from high school. In this setting, the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association recommended in 1899 that secondary-school history teachers follow a sequence consisting of ancient history, European history, English history, and American history. The teacher's job, as we look back at it now, was clear: teach the progress of Western civilization to an elite group of young Americans.

Some two decades later views had changed. Historians such as Charles Beard and James Harvey Robinson demanded that the profession give attention to society, culture, and economics, as well as to politics. They were far from certain that historians could discover truth simply by arranging facts. The social sciences were beginning to challenge the supremacy of history in the study of human behavior. The stakes were higher in that a quarter-million students (about fifteen percent of those aged eighteen) graduated each year from high school. In 1916, the Committee on the Social Studies of the National Education Association drew up a new sequence. The new curriculum required no history in the ninth grade, called for world history in the tenth, American history in the eleventh, and problems of democracy in the twelfth grade. The teacher's task, as Progressive America saw it, was to teach Americans to be good citizens.

At the start of the 1980s there is far less agreement than in those earlier eras about what the teacher must do. Half a century of experience with totalitarian rule has taught historians to be wary of individuals and regimes who are certain that they know the "truth" and are eager to use history teaching to reinforce their brand of "citizenship." The histories of Russia, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and South America claim their rightful place in the curriculum, as does the history of women. Urban, Black, Chicano, and Indian history rival more traditional topics in American history. "Psychohistory," the "new social history," and the "new political history" all present their interpretations of the past. Behavioral scientists and quantifiers offer alternative ways of studying human behavior, as do the practitioners of "oral history"; and some of the social sciences are firmly established in the curriculum. In some programs the word "history" continues to be replaced by "social studies." Curriculum centers present new programs for the teacher and new ways to teach. At the same time, inflation and the tightening of the economy have led to a "back to basics" movement and other restraints on the curriculum. It is diffi-

cult to generalize about the normal curriculum today, but most schools which have a high percentage of students bound for college probably offer world history in the tenth grade, some form of American history in the eleventh grade, and a variety of electives in the twelfth grade. The stakes are higher than ever, for now over 3,000,000 students graduate each year from high school (about seventy-five percent of those aged eighteen). Teaching history in the high schools in our era is a confusing, demanding, and open-ended task.

Society today, therefore, expects a program of preparation to produce secondary-school history teachers whose knowledge includes many areas of the world, teachers able to make effective intellectual contact with students of widely divergent levels of mental ability and of motivation, and of many different ethnic, economic, religious, and social backgrounds; teachers familiar not only with history but also with other subjects that study human behavior.

We believe that the role of history is to provide a critical approach to the past, not simply to store and transmit the data that society wants remembered. Training in history, by providing this critical approach, greatly increases understanding of human behavior and the human condition. The study of history increases such understanding in the same way that greater experience in the life of the individual can augment understanding: in each case there can be an increase of information, an increase in ability to distinguish accurate from inaccurate data, and an increase in the range of perspectives from which one can visualize and interpret information. Such direct experience, or vicarious experience through the study of history, can make one more aware of the range of human behavior, can make one more sensitive to both the presence and absence of uniformities in human behavior, can make one more alert to the ways in which human events frequently have happened, can enable one to see the world through the eyes of another era, and thus see that what appears so certain or so obvious in one age does not seem certain or obvious in another. We recognize the importance of the social sciences, the behavioral sciences, and the humanities in the study of human behavior; in this statement, however, we speak only in regard to the teaching of history.

In order to produce effective teachers, a program of preparation depends in part upon the selection of individuals who possess the intellectual potential for becoming good teachers of history. History teachers should be able to communicate easily with others. They should furthermore be intelligent, sophisticated models for their students. They should be intellectually honest, aware of their own fallibility, continually eager to learn. High motivation is essential. Unless individuals have a genuine and strong desire to teach history,

even strong training programs stand a poor chance of molding them into outstanding teachers. If individuals are drifting or backing into teaching because no other profession or occupation seems open, or because they do not possess the aptitudes required, say, to teach mathematics or the natural sciences, it is unlikely that their training programs will have much success. Teachers who are highly motivated are needed because they are convinced that the study of human behavior through the discipline of history is worthwhile, and convinced also that it is worthwhile to teach this study to students of secondary-school age. An effective training program may maintain or even enhance such motivation, but it probably cannot create it. We think that high school and college teachers should play a more active role than they do at present, both in urging some individuals to become high school teachers of history and also in discouraging others.

II. Programs of Preparation for Secondary-School History Teachers

It is convenient to divide programs of preparation for secondary-school history teachers into three parts, although the lines of division are often difficult to distinguish clearly: general educational background, training in history and closely related subjects, and training in teaching. Completion of these three portions of the prospective teacher's preparation will probably require virtually all of the undergraduate program. We prefer that a student take an additional year before becoming a teacher. Some states, such as California, require the fifth year before granting certification. Programs for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) are designed for completion during a fifth year. Students with a poor high school background or those who have decided to become history teachers late in their undergraduate careers will probably need a fifth year to complete their programs. But we realize that a fifth year is not always possible. We have sought, therefore, to suggest a model four-year undergraduate program for the preparation of secondary-school history teachers.

General Educational Background

Since we hold that the winning of the intellectual interest and respect of students is a prime characteristic of the well-prepared teacher, we consider it essential that the teacher's program of preparation provide the breadth and depth of education that will enable him or her to stand before students and associates as an educated person. Such persons should ideally know something of human society

and the forces that impinge upon it; they should have respect for knowledge and curiosity that drives them to continued learning; they should be committed to individual and social values which guide them toward responsible ethical behavior and useful activities. This ideal should be constantly kept in mind as a standard in planning curricula for future teachers. Specifically, we think that teachers in their undergraduate programs should have acquired significant and useful understanding in the general areas of language, literature, the arts, philosophy, mathematics, natural science, history, religion, social and behavioral science. Many colleges and universities require that all students in the general arts and sciences curriculum take a program that includes some study in each of several major areas of human knowledge (natural sciences, humanities, social and behavioral sciences). This requirement is valuable because it exposes students to new ideas in unfamiliar areas before they begin to concentrate in one subject. We regard these programs as a proper way to strengthen the students' general educational background.

Understanding of nations and cultures other than one's own is one characteristic of an educated person. The mastery of a foreign language and studies in the geography, history, and literature of a foreign country provide means of becoming familiar with another society. Such studies also give insights into one's own society. "He knows not England," as the classic precept puts the case, "who only England knows." Whatever the pattern of study, we urge that prospective teachers be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a society with a language and culture different from their own.

We do not believe it possible to prescribe precisely the amount of college study that should be devoted to acquiring general educational background; the wide diversity in the background of college freshmen and the variety of institutions that prospective teachers attend make that impossible. Colleges and universities must recognize that many of their entering freshmen have taken advanced college-level courses in secondary school, and should not require them to duplicate previous work in their freshmen courses. With good training in secondary school and the proper meshing of secondary- school and college programs, probably one-third of an undergraduate program devoted to general educational background would be adequate.

Training in History

We think that persons who teach history at the secondary-school level should receive thorough training in history. While we recognize that teachers trained principally in the humanities or in the social and behavioral sciences often do a good job of teaching history, we believe that those well-trained in history stand the best chance of teaching it well. The day never existed when any teacher with little or no training as a historian could teach history properly at the secondary-school level. Fortunately there is now an increasing recognition that just as the secondary-school teacher of mathematics or of French or of chemistry needs to be carefully trained in his or her subject, so too does the teacher of history. The abandonment of small secondary schools through consolidation of smaller school districts, and the consequent development of large secondary schools or educational centers, should enable administrators to assign history teachers to history courses with more regularity.

We recommend that a prospective history teacher take an undergraduate major in history, which might amount to fifty quarter hours (of 180 required for graduation) or thirty-three semester hours (of 120). Since some of these courses can also satisfy portions of general education requirements, we believe our recommendation practical.

Particularly important is the quality of the history courses as guides to, and examples of, the study of history. Historians are not agreed whether history is a discipline with a particular structure. Yet virtually all historians hold that there should be a disciplined approach to history, that history should be studied according to certain proper procedures or rules that can be taught and learned. Ground rules for evaluating conflicting testimony and evidence would be examples. History is more effectively studied, they argue, by a trained historian, all other factors being equal, than by an individual with no training. When pursued according to these proper procedures, the study of history can lead to the worthwhile intellectual benefits we have cited above.

In order for the study of history to increase understanding, it must be taught and studied so that the students increase their mastery of factual information, strengthen their ability to evaluate conflicting evidence and interpretation, and come to "feel" the past. In a successful course the student will see the world through the eyes of individuals, say, in fifth-century B.C. Athens, or in twelfth-century A.D. China, or in nineteenth-century United States. If the history courses taken by the prospective teacher do not accomplish these objectives, they have failed in their purpose, no matter how many credit hours are

registered on the official transcript. The crucial factor is the quality of the history course.

In choosing which specific history courses to take, the criteria should include both chronological and geographic distribution, coupled with the study of at least one period or area in depth. Since most secondary schools require a year-long course in American history, it seems reasonable to require substantial study of American history by prospective teachers. Teachers should have at least eighteen quarter hours (or twelve semester hours) of advanced undergraduate study in American history, in addition to an initial survey course. Equivalent courses designed to satisfy requirements in general education, or an equivalent course in secondary school for which advanced standing has been awarded, will often serve in place of the survey course.

A second history course, and one that enrolls a considerable portion of the school population, is world history, usually taught at the tenth-grade level. To be prepared to teach this course in world history, and also to understand United States history in perspective, the future teacher of history should take several courses focused on the history of societies other than the United States, and focused on chronological eras before 1492. Through these courses prospective teachers should familiarize themselves with the history of at least one non-Western society.

To the virtue of historical breadth, the complementary virtue is depth. A given society or a given chronological period, or both, must be studied in enough depth to give the prospective teacher a real immersion, a vivid sense of the "feel" of the society or the period. It is obviously impossible for any teacher to acquire expert knowledge of the many societies and chronological eras comprising a course in world history. Some schools try to cope with this problem by teaching the course in world history through a team of teachers who combine their individual classes periodically, with each teacher taking primary responsibility for those portions of the course with which he or she is most familiar. A second solution is to replace the world history course with several courses that are focused on those societies other than the United States, with whose history the teachers are most familiar. We prefer that tenth-grade students take a course of high quality focused on any area or era that the teacher knows well, than take a routine survey in world history focused on societies or periods with which the teacher is not really familiar.

The fundamental goal should remain clear: the prospective teacher should take history courses of high quality whose subject matter provides cultural and chronological breadth, coupled with in-depth study of one or more societies or periods.

Training in Subjects Closely Related to History

Teachers of history need also to receive training in other subjects that study human behavior--subjects in the humanities and the social and behavioral sciences. Increased interest in psychohistory and increased use of quantification in political and social history make courses in psychology, for example, and the use of the computer valuable. Training in the humanities and the social sciences should increase prospective teachers' understanding of human behavior. It should also enrich their understanding of the possibilities for studying human behavior through subjects other than history. It should augment their understanding of the nature of history, which is similar in some respects to the study of social and behavioral science, while similar in other respects to humanistic study. And finally, it may suggest possibilities for interdisciplinary cooperation among the various subjects concerned with the study of human actions. We believe that a historian well trained in other subjects would be the ideal person to teach or to organize an interdisciplinary course on the study of human behavior.

There are important differences between history and the social and behavioral sciences. Among other things, many behavioral and social scientists consider their disciplines as sciences, the ultimate goal of which is the establishment of a science of human behavior. The proper models for the study of mankind, in this view, are to be found in the natural sciences. Many historians, by contrast, do not think that the study of humanity is a science. Historians' materials, they say, are often limited; they frequently lack the factual data, such as the statistical runs employed by the social scientists. History, therefore, is not a science per se, although it often employs the disciplined techniques of the scientific method. Nor is history the same as one of the humanities. Historians are limited: they are not as free as novelists and artists. They can create characters and events, while the historian must deal with actual people and real episodes. The humanist may create, but the historian must re-create the past.

Far more important than these distinctions is the common ground that the social and behavioral sciences, the humanities, and history occupy. All are concerned with understanding human beings. Like the social and behavioral scientist, the historian respects data and insists that generalizations be based on the careful observation, collection, arrangement, and evaluation of data. The various disciplines reinforce one another. When social and behavioral scientists use the past, they often rely upon the data provided by the historian; whenever historians deal with such topics as money, race or

political parties, they use the data and insights of the social and behavioral scientist. Historians today turn frequently to the social and behavioral sciences to draw conclusions about the past. The American historian is interested in the psychology of Thomas Jefferson. The English historian must understand the economics of English industrial growth. As allies, history and the social and behavioral sciences provide indispensable and often complementary ways of studying people and society.

The historian has much in common with the humanist. Like the artist and the writer, the historian uses imagination and intuition, sees people as individuals, presents a mood, tells a story. In many languages the word for history is the same as the word for story. The historian is also concerned with intangibles which may be difficult to measure in any precise, mathematical way--"There is poetry in life," the historian W. Stull Holt has written. "And the history, or any science, that omits the poetry from life is both untrue and dangerous."[2]

History encompasses all fields of learning. While neither an art nor a science, history bridges the gap between the humanities and the sciences. To be successful, history has to combine scientific and humanistic approaches without diluting the special values of either. During the last decade, for example, historians have used both statistical and literary evidence to further our understanding of the antebellum South. Successful historians develop their own arguments and interpretations and in the process give humane character to all branches of knowledge. With effective training, the history teacher is in a position to contribute leadership to interdisciplinary programs in the secondary-school curriculum.

The future history teacher should take at least forty quarter hours (or twenty-seven semester hours) in subjects closely related to history; preferably he or she should concentrate these hours in one humanistic subject and in one social science or behavioral science discipline.

[2] W. Stull Holt, Historical Scholarship in The United States and Other Essays (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967), 82.

Training in Teaching

The concept of training in teaching has been the subject of bitter controversy. At one extreme, some individuals in colleges of education have maintained that "teaching is teaching, regardless of the subject taught," and that there is a science of teaching applicable to any subject matter; from these positions they have concluded that the most important item in the preparation of teachers is not training in the subject matter but rather training in teaching. At an opposite extreme, some university historians and others have maintained that it is either unnecessary or impossible to train individuals in teaching, and they have concluded that prospective teachers need be trained only in subject matter. Those who have held it unnecessary to train future teachérs have stated that teaching is not difficult: just take scholars who know the subject matter thoroughly, let them wrestle with important problems in front of a class, and there you have good teaching. Those who have held that training in teaching is impossible have insisted that good teaching is an art which cannot be taught; only a fortunate combination of personal characteristics can produce a good teacher, they have said, and those fortunate combinations may take any one of a thousand configurations that are impossible to predict and impossible to induce through training.

We think that much of this controversy has been premised upon an exaggerated distinction between training in subject matter and training in methods of teaching. Subject matter and methods of teaching subject matter are, in our view, inextricably intertwined. "Most students learn to teach by imitating their teachers," as Professor Edwin Fenton has written. "For this reason, every subject course becomes an implicit methods course."[3] Thus, we hold that much of the prospective teacher's training in teaching will take place, for better or worse, in his or her courses in history and in other subjects in secondary school and in college. If, for example, the history courses in secondary school and college have successfully made history come alive for prospective teachers, if they have made them feel what it was like to live in medieval France or late nineteenth-century Japan, then when they become teachers and face classes, they will probably try to employ some of the methods used by their former teachers. If, furthermore, the history courses have established the values that men

[3] Edwin Fenton, ed., Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966), 2.

and women derive from the study of history, then the prospective teacher will be better able to make the study of history relevant to high school students. If, on the contrary, secondary-school or college teachers fail to make history come alive and fail to explain what history is all about, then there will be no worthwhile examples for the prospective teacher.

But methods of teaching that may have been successful with college classes may be unsuccessful, or largely so, with classes in secondary school. Secondary-school students will be, of course, several years younger than those in college, and they will show a much greater variation in general intelligence, in level of preparation, in motivation, and in family background than do college students. Teachers in secondary-school history courses, therefore, need information concerning such matters as the psychology of adolescents, the processes by which pre-adults learn, the handling of discipline problems of the sort that rarely arise in college classrooms. We believe that prospective teachers of history in the secondary schools need training in teaching secondary-school pupils, in addition to the training in teaching which they receive explicitly or implicitly in the history courses they take.

Teachers often testify that the most valuable part of their training was student teaching. Through a well-designed program of student teaching, prospective teachers can test and practice what they learned in their program of preparation. In addition, the supervisory teacher and the supervisor from college can give much guidance to students as they develop toward independent responsibility. We think that training in teaching should center on programs of student teaching, because of their proven worth. This is the practice of several programs leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), which were developed after World War II. We recommend that student teaching occupy one full quarter of the program of preparation (fifteen to sixteen quarter hours or the equivalent in semester hours).

In contrast to their approval for student teaching, teachers have shown mixed reactions to courses in methods of teaching. We recommend that programs of preparation contain no courses in general methods of teaching or "methods of teaching in the secondary school"; we urge, instead, that they include only one methods course, "teaching history in secondary schools," which would last for one quarter (or semester) and carry three hours of credit. For this course to be of maximum worth, it is essential that it be linked closely to student teaching and that it be tied to subject matter: the course should be taken by the prospective teacher in the quarter or semester immediately preceding student teaching, and it should be taught by

individuals who are closely associated with the student teaching program and who, if possible, have taught history in secondary schools.

We are encouraged that more college and university historians are concerned with teacher training than was the case two or three decades ago. Some college and university departments of history have assigned one of their faculty to primary responsibility for supervision of student teaching. In some cases, these faculty members are university historians who have themselves taught history at the secondary-school level. In some institutions, the university faculty member teaches the methods course in collaboration with a practicing secondary-school teacher of history from the community, who is involved in the supervision of student teachers. We see that as an ideal arrangement. The crucial consideration is that the methods course be a form of guild instruction, in which experienced and highly successful members, or former members, of the guild of secondary-school history teachers describe to prospective teachers how they have conducted classes, perhaps with visits to classrooms as part of the course. Such a methods course would be worthwhile and direct preparation for student teaching.

In addition to student teaching and its complementary course in methods, the program of training in teaching might well include two additional one-quarter courses, one focused on the psychological foundations of education and the other on the social and historical foundation of education. The former might profitably consider human growth and development, personality, the learning process, and evaluation and measurement of learning. This course will probably require a previous course in general psychology to establish a framework of concepts and vocabulary: such a prior course might easily be a part of the prospective teacher's general educational background. The course of the social and historical foundations of education might consider the ways in which societies have passed along their cultural heritage from generation to generation, the ideas and ideals which have been expressed about education, the significance of education and of schools in American society, the nature of schools and school systems, and current issues and criticisms that relate to schools.

Traditionally, courses on the psychological and on the social and historical foundations of education have been taken by prospective teachers before they undertake student teaching. We understand the logic of this traditional arrangement but think that a case can be made for taking these courses after completion of student teaching--at a time when the future teachers have been introduced firsthand to classroom teaching. That exposure has probably raised problems and questions for which they seek solutions, and provided a background of

experience from which they can consider broad questions concerning the social and historical role of education. Some of the MAT programs have successfully tried this latter sequence in which student teaching precedes courses in the psychological, social, and historical foundations of education.

The course in the psychological foundations of education and that in the social and historical foundations would, under the quarter system, together carry six hours of credit. Added to the fifteen hours for student teaching and the three hours for the methods course, this would make a total of twenty-four hours of credit, or less than one-sixth of a total undergraduate program of 180 credit hours. This training will have the maximum benefit if it is focused constantly upon the actual classroom situation. In order to provide that focus early in the undergraduate career of a prospective teacher, one university, in cooperation with the local public school system, has instituted an extracurricular program of supervised observation visits in secondary-school classrooms; students who are thinking of becoming teachers are encouraged to make such observation visits as early as their sophomore year.

In sum, we suggest the following four-year undergraduate program for prospective history teachers:

1. general education: approximately sixty quarter hours or one-third of the program;
2. studies in history and closely related disciplines: approximately ninety-two hours or one-half of the program;
3. training in teaching: approximately twenty-four hours or one-sixth of the program.

As stated above, we prefer to see the training spread over five years.

The training in teaching should be focused upon conditions in the schools in order to encourage prospective teachers to consider the applications of their entire college program to the continuing debates over the goals of teaching. We do not propose to list all possible goals, but we will suggest several that are generally accepted. One goal is to help students better understand themselves and their society. A second goal is to encourage students to ask questions about human affairs and to help them go about seeking "responses" (not necessarily "answers") to these questions. The history teacher can help produce adults who will ask meaningful questions about subjects such as politics or foreign policy and who will insist on receiving germane "responses." A third goal is simply to introduce students to the fascinating story of the past. And all programs must confront students with the debate over the role of facts and values in teaching.

Even when teachers agree on goals, there may be little consensus on how to achieve them. But most will agree on what not to do. History teachers should not, for example, require their students simply to memorize either "facts" or "generalizations," but should try to supply the context within which the "facts" or "generalizations" acquire meaning. Students should learn that facts and generalizations cannot exist without each other. They must also be made aware of the complexity of facts. Knowledge of facts and evidence is essential in the study of history. It is crucial for students of history at any level to know that the French Revolution, for example, occurred toward the close of the eighteenth century, rather than in the fifth century or the twentieth century. The chronological order of events is a basic characteristic, knowledge of which is necessary to understand the events. But historians realize also that, in practice, facts exist when they collect them from the past and thereby allow them to exist. Historians talk about evidence, data, and findings, as well as about facts, but they nevertheless rest their understanding of the past upon information which they have verified to the best of their ability and training.

Another important issue today concerns the role of discovery teaching. Exponents of discovery or inductive teaching urge that teachers should provide students with a body of historical data from which they can discover portions of the past for themselves and share in the interest and excitement of discovery. Better to let them read three accounts by foreign travelers, they say, than to tell them what America in the 1840s was like. They argue further that broad chronological coverage of names and dates should be sacrificed to understanding in depth of a shorter period or a specific issue.

Defenders of expository teaching reply that teachers should not abandon their role as instructors and leave the students without guidance. Teachers should, they say, use their professional skills to explain the past to inexperienced students. They insist that the teacher cover a wide body of material. Sometimes the discussion comes down to a debate over the relative merits of lecturing and Socratic discussion. Proponents of the former argue that students learn best about history by listening to a professional use data and concepts to reach historical conclusions. But advocates of discussion point out that students pay better attention when they are dealing with the data and making the generalizations themselves.

Teachers quite naturally use both types of teaching. Since they are experienced in history, they are indispensable in helping the student to determine what is important and how to see the past in perspective. For instance, a teacher should explain the background of

the battle over the Second Bank of the United States before immersing students in the congressional debates over the Bank's rechartering. But having done that, the teacher could allow the students to read the rhetoric of the debates, the newspaper comments, and Jackson's veto message to discover for themselves what the participants were saying. The discovery method is not new to the historian, for ever since Herodotus history has meant inquiry or discovery. Effective history teachers should present their courses in such a way that the students derive the benefits from both expository and discovery techniques. They should be slaves neither to coverage nor depth but should present enough varied situations to offer students an exposure to both.

The treatment of pressing public issues poses a special challenge to the teacher of history and the social studies. Certainly rivalries of different ethnic and religious groups, the war in Vietnam, and the issues of protecting the environment and of overcoming economic inflation, have dramatized the debate over teaching values in history classes. Some argue that it is the teacher's duty to shape the students' attitudes on the "gut" issues of the day. They would have the students weigh the actions of historical figures on the scales of current moral standards. Others, however, cry that teachers have no business trying to shape values. Instead, they say, they should devote their time to helping students learn what actually happened without forcing them to take sides. Value shaping, they maintain, is brainwashing.

Values have always been involved in history teaching. They have been implicit in the textbooks that have been oriented toward white male politics. By the very selection of materials the teacher shapes values. The teacher who spends three weeks on the abolition of slavery and two days on taxation and banking in American history is telling the students that racial relations were more important than debates over government economic policies. By the use of such dates as 1776, 1789, and 1861, the teacher reinforces the student's concern for national political history. The teacher's own personality, behavior, and appearance also will suggest values to students.

While it is impossible to divorce value judgements from the teaching of history, we think that the primary value which should be reflected in history teaching is the conviction that it is worthwhile to study the past in order to increase understanding of the present. In studying the American Revolution, to take one example, the primary goal might be to increase knowledge and understanding of the manner in which individuals in the thirteen colonies reacted to the Revolution as "patriots," "loyalists," and "neutralists"--rather than to inculcate sympathy for any of these groups.

Teachers today must choose from among many different methods of teaching. Should they lecture or encourage class discussion? Should they cooperate with others in team teaching or work alone? Should reading assignments take precedence over visual aids or source materials over secondary writing? What about field trips? There is usually no sensible all-one-or-the-other solution for such questions. Team teaching has merit where teachers can combine individual skills and where it provides free time for teachers to develop useful materials. Source materials give immediacy and are the favorite of the discovery advocates, but often secondary accounts present events in far better perspective. Field trips use up a great deal of time, but upper-class suburban high school students might benefit from attending inner-city juvenile court session. Teachers must decide which materials and methods will best suit the needs of a particular course and student audience.

Above all we are concerned about the preparation of professional history teachers. The United States today needs a corps of professionals to teach history in the schools. Carl Becker once declared that every man is his own historian. Every adult does use the skills and insights of the historian constantly in his or her daily life. The history teacher must awaken the curiosity, widen the horizons, deepen the understanding, and sharpen the perspective of students. A career in teaching is second to none in importance.

In order to produce such teachers, a program of preparation will require an undergraduate institution with high caliber faculty, a wide range of subjects and courses, and strong library resources. Everyone connected with the preparation of secondary-school history teachers should constantly be concerned over the quality of the programs of preparation and should not assume that any four-year educational institution is adequate to prepare teachers. An institution that does not possess the quality of faculty, the range of subjects and courses, and the size and quality of library necessary for the sort of program described in this pamphlet, should not attempt, and should not be allowed to attempt, to prepare teachers of history for secondary schools.

III. Supplementing Programs of Preparation

The programs described above will be of maximum effectiveness in preparing secondary-school history teachers only if they are supplemented in a number of ways. Two can be mentioned here. One necessary way is to insure that only persons who have received proper training be allowed to teach history courses in the secondary schools. Of all the problems which have beset the teaching of history in the secondary schools during the past several decades, none has had more unfortunate consequences than the fact that the subject has frequently been taught by persons inadequately trained in history. Since these persons have been unable to approach history in a disciplined way, they have relied of necessity upon the textbook. Students of such teachers have realized that they are getting nothing from the teacher, have naturally become bored and resentful, and have lost any liking or respect they may have had for history, geography, or other social studies subjects.

One main root of this problem is the assumption of some school administrators that no special training or competence is required to teach history. This situation has been due, some have maintained, to the contention that the goal of teaching history is "citizenship" and the resulting conclusion that "citizenship" is a matter of common knowledge which can be taught by any teacher. A contributing cause, say some others, is that the inclusive term used to designate a general area of the curriculum, "social studies," has been misused to indicate a specific subject. Since this subject, designated as "social studies," is not related to any one intellectual discipline in which research and instruction are carried on at the university level, there are no findings to convey to students and no rigorous standards to guide teachers and students in their pursuit of knowledge. We urge that within the general curriculum area of "social studies," individual courses be identified as "history," "geography," "political science," or whatever subject is being taught, to indicate the primary intellectual discipline employed in the course. If interdisciplinary courses are introduced (and this prospect seems to be very promising), those teaching the course should make it clear what disciplines are involved. As we have stated earlier, we feel that the history teacher is well qualified to take a leading part in these courses, and they will be better courses if several teachers, each trained in a different discipline, participate jointly.

Some states require that a teacher's assignment during the first, or first and second, year of teaching consist of classes solely in the curriculum area in which the teacher received certification (social studies, or languages arts, or whatever). But such requirements offer no barriers to misassignment after the first or second year of teaching, and there are also disadvantages in inflexible bureaucratic rules. It is the responsibility primarily of principals and of teachers directly involved to see that only adequately trained individuals teach history (or any other subject). If principals and the teachers directly involved do not carry out their responsibilities, it would seem appropriate that members of the community call the situation to the attention of the school superintendent or, if necessary, to the school board.

A second way in which programs of preparation require supplementation is that teachers must continue their reading and study of history after they have embarked upon their teaching careers. Serious obstacles at present discourage practicing teachers from additional reading and study in history. The nonscholarly atmosphere of many secondary schools is an obstacle; that obstacle becomes formidable if the principal or other administrative officials seem to have no concern for, or a positive antipathy toward, scholarship; the obstacle becomes even more formidable if the chair of the teacher's department and his or her fellow teachers are basically uninterested in the further study of the subjects they teach. Another major difficulty is the heavy teaching load common in secondary schools--five classes per day with some 150 students, papers to grade, preparations for class, plus extra duties in lunchrooms or with various student activities during or after the regular school day. In view of these obstacles, it is understandable, however regrettable, that some secondary-school teachers of history come, at times without realizing it, to picture themselves as glorified baby-sitters and lose the intellectual interest which originally impelled them to study and teach history.

Despite these restraints, many secondary-school history teachers do find some time to continue to read works of history--and those teachers are usually the superior ones. Few situations in life are more tragic than that of the teacher of any subject at any level of instruction who has gone intellectually stale and who thus no longer has anything fresh and worthwhile to present to students. We are convinced that teachers can best prevent this situation by making time regularly available for reading and research in historical journals, works of history, or in such historical sources as diaries, letters, or periodicals, when these are pertinent to their classroom

responsibilities. Through this reading the teacher will be able to keep up with important changes in interpretation. Teachers of American history, for example, should be aware of new ways of interpreting party formation, slavery, and Reconstruction in nineteenth-century America.

Teachers are constantly giving part of themselves intellectually to their students, and their intellectual resources must continually be replaced and refreshed. The organization of a regular monthly meeting of history teachers to discuss a recent book or article can provide an impetus for a regular program of reading. A department of teachers might, by such an example, succeed in making the atmosphere of its school more scholarly and more intellectually stimulating. Time spent in such ways is likely to be more rewarding than attending that type of workshop which takes the form of a pep meeting or an experience in busywork without any focus upon the scholarly, intellectual, and classroom interests and needs of teachers.

In addition, teachers should return to universities for graduate work during their careers. Often this can be done in the summer. Unfortunately far less money is available for university-based programs of teacher training in history and other related subjects than was true in the 1960s. Despite tight budgets, school administrators will have to realize that much of the responsibility for supporting and sustaining advanced study for teachers lies with the schools. We recommend that schools provide release time for teachers to prepare new courses and sabbatical leaves for teachers to continue their training.

If every person is his or her own historian, then it is all the more important that the history teacher be a sound professional historian. The teacher should be a historian as well as a history teacher--if indeed there is any distinction. Teachers will find it difficult to train students to approach history in a sound and meaningful fashion if they are not professional historians themselves. This is not to suggest that teachers should have doctorates (some of that training would be superfluous), but they must be carefully trained in history and they must continue historical studies all their lives.

IV. Cooperation and Coordination of Effort Between Teachers of History in Secondary Schools and Those in Colleges and Universities

The capstone of successful programs of preparation, in our view, rests with increased cooperation and coordination of effort among teachers of history in secondary schools and those in colleges and universities. Well-prepared secondary-school history teachers should have interests compatible with those of well-trained teachers of history in colleges and universities. We hope that each group will realize this mutual compatibility, will recognize their mutual interdependence, and will cooperate with each other and coordinate their efforts.

One of the most encouraging signs in recent decades has been increased contact and conversation among teachers of history in secondary schools and those in colleges and universities. In 1954, the American Historical Association established a Committee on Teaching, composed of both secondary-school and university teachers, and under the auspices of that committee the Service Center for Teachers of History was formed in 1956. When the American Historical Association was reorganized in 1974, a Teaching Division was established as one of the association's three primary divisions, and the Teaching Division absorbed the Service Center and the Committee on Teaching, while continuing their functions. The Teaching Division, like the Service Center, has joined with college and university history departments in sponsoring conferences that involve secondary-school and university teachers of history. In some localities those conferences have become annual events, sometimes reviving meetings that had been abandoned years ago. Some of these conferences have been instituted by organizations of secondary-school teachers, such as local councils of the National Council for the Social Studies. In addition, a number of sessions at each annual meeting of the association are devoted to teaching, and the monthly newsletter of the association contains a feature column entitled "Teaching History Today," which carries essays on strategies of teaching.

Since the mid-1950s secondary-school and college and university teachers of history have cooperated in the Advanced Placement Program in History. In this program secondary schools have established special courses, whose graduates have received college and university

recognition and credit for their work. During the 1960s, the John Hay Fellowship Program (now discontinued) and summer institutes such as those supported by the NDEA (now discontinued) provided opportunities for dialogue between teachers of history in the secondary schools and those in colleges and universities. The dialogue between those two groups was continued and was expanded to include a third group, faculty members of colleges or departments of education, in a program sponsored by the American Historical Association in the 1960s and 1970s, the History Education Project. With funds provided by the U.S. Office of Education, the History Education Project recruited and supported a number of regional "teams," each team based in the history department of a college or university and each team composed of two or three representatives from each of the three groups mentioned above--secondary-school teachers of history, college or university teachers of history, and faculty members of colleges or departments of education. These teams sought in a variety of ways to improve in their local regions both the teaching of history at all levels of instruction and also the preparation of teachers of history at all levels of instruction. Of the many valuable legacies from the History Education Project, two in particular deserve mention. One was providing impetus for the rejuvenation and improvement of The History Teacher, a quarterly journal established in the 1960s, the only journal in the United States devoted excusively to the teaching of history at all levels, and one which every teacher of history should read. A second legacy from the History Education Project is the tradition of the three groups mentioned above working together, thereby providing what is probably still the most practical model for improving the preparation of secondary-school teachers of history, and one of the most practical models for improving the teaching of history.

Within recent years historians at all levels have worked together on a variety of projects. One of the most extensive examples of cooperation is the National History Day Program, as indicated in the opening pages of this pamphlet. In other examples, secondary-school and college and university historians have together devised new social studies curricula in specific high schools or have combined their talents to create new social studies materials for all schools. University historians have taught in secondary schools. Departments of history in colleges and universities have invited secondary-school history teachers to offer classes in "methods of teaching," to supervise student teachers, and to plan and run summer institutes. Some college and university historians have held joint appointments in colleges or departments of education.

But, however extensive the contacts, they do not automatically lead to understanding and cooperation. If all of the increasing number of personal relationships described above between secondary-school history teachers and their counterparts in the colleges and universities are to lead to fruitful dialogue and to successful cooperation, both groups must seek to understand the special situation and problems of the other. Both groups must also realize that they are ultimately engaged in different phases of the same general enterprise and thus have a basis for cooperation and a necessity for it.

Above all, college and university historians must realize that they are part of the same world as the secondary-school teacher of history, must realize that various acts of commission and omission by university historians bear much of the responsibility for those aspects of the situation of the secondary-school teacher which are least appealing to the university historian. If, for example, secondary-school teachers lack a clear sense of the nature of history as an intellectual discipline, is it not possible that they were never given the necessary guidance by their college teachers? Such is the charge made by one university historian who has concerned himself extensively with the teaching of history at the precollege level. Professor Richard H. Brown, writing of the preparation of teachers, has stated that

> the teacher who would teach history well has got to be trained by the historian, and the historian is not doing the job well. So long as he sees the point of teaching history as simply the communication of conclusions about the past, he will not do the job better. He has got to get across to prospective teachers some sense of what history is, not just of what the conclusions of the historians are. The problem is not, as unthinking historians have put it from time immemorial. . .that teachers do not "know" enough history. It is that they do not know what history is and that they have never been encouraged to think about how it can be used in the growth and development of the human beings they teach.[4]

[4] Richard H. Brown "History as Discovery: An Interim Report on the Amherst Project" in Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools, ed. Edwin Fenton, 448.

Secondary-school history teachers naturally resent the criticism by university historians that their teaching is dull, lifeless, and ineffective, when they remember from their undergraduate days dull, lifeless, and ineffective lectures by these same university historians. When the harassed teacher of history in the schools looks back on his college courses in history, writes one secondary-school teacher:

> he can merely speculate about a mixed assemblage of scholars, most of whom, because they could not or would not teach, have failed him as appropriate models of how to convey solid historical content to his students in meaningful fashion. He can hardly be expected to feel much sympathy for the plaints of those same college professors when they decry the caliber of their incoming freshmen.[5]

University historians must realize, in short, that they are part of the process of preparation which produces the secondary-school teacher of history, and part of the process which produces the poorly trained or well-trained undergraduate in history.

If university historians realize their role in this broad process, then it is obviously in their self-interest to assist secondary-school teachers in a variety of ways:

by taking an active part in programs of preparation for secondary-school teachers of history, an active part both in classes in history and also in the methods course, the student teaching program, and in the establishment of requirements for certification; this will involve acquaintance with and cooperation with faculty members in departments or colleges of education and with officials in state departments of education;

by organizing summer, or year-long, institutes or classes available at times when teachers can take them, to assist secondary-school teachers to increase and refresh their knowledge of history;

by helping to secure better teaching materials for secondary-school classes in history;

by helping to convince school administrators and the general public of the importance of lighter teaching loads and sabbatical leaves for secondary-school teachers, so that teachers can increase and enrich their knowledge of history;

[5] Ira Marienhoff, "A High School Teacher Looks at College Teaching," AHA Newsletter, April, 1967, 16.

by helping to convince school administrators of the importance of assigning only well-prepared teachers for history classes;

by accepting invitations to work with secondary-school history classes, history clubs, or groups of secondary-school teachers of history, including such projects as National History Day.

Secondary-school teachers, meanwhile, can improve the quality of history teaching in colleges and universities in several ways:

by making college teachers aware of the new methods of teaching that have been so successful in the high schools;

by helping college teachers understand the values and attitudes of the young people, so many of whom are bound for college;

by suggesting ways in which the colleges can avoid the dull and pointless repetition of history courses already given in high schools;

by helping colleges and universities with their programs of teacher training, including helping university historians and university professors of education to cooperate with one another.

Teachers of history at colleges and universities and at the high schools should derive great satisfaction from working together in a common cause. All are engaged in the effort to spread and increase a knowledge of the findings of historians and a knowledge of what the discipline of history is and how it is practiced. These common professional functions and shared goals provide bonds among teachers of history at all levels of instruction, if they take their occupation seriously. Recognition that they are engaged in a common enterprise, even though there is a division of labor, should serve to bridge the gap between secondary-school teachers of history and their college and university counterparts.

Those who are sympathetic with the views set forth in this pamphlet might begin by seeing that copies of it are made available to the teaching and administrative personnel in their own institutions who are responsible for the preparation of history teachers, to the superintendents of schools in their own communities, to the certification officers in their own state departments of education, and to prospective teachers. Whether or not all agree with our views, the report should at least focus attention on certain specific problems, issues, and possible solutions, that deserve the full attention of everyone concerned.

The effective preparation of history teachers will remain a matter of crucial importance to the historical profession and to the entire academic community. Given the fast pace of curricular reforms, the increasing use of sophisticated audiovisual materials in classroom instruction, the experiments with innovative teaching strategies, the emergence of new theories of learning, and the growing awareness of the student's role in a total learning situation, this pamphlet is designed to pose questions and suggest guidelines for the preparation of teachers. It does not pretend to be a total or a final statement. Fortunately, the academic community is committed to ongoing reassessment of its needs and opportunities as conditions change; this pamphlet is meant to make a positive contribution to this open-ended program of evaluation.